| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|----------------|--|--|
| 177 | Universal   |                | NOTE: Question #177 from the June 6 web posting is re-issued here. Clause L33 of the Enterprise RFP prohibits an offeror from including both the mandatory IP and mandatory Wireless services in a single proposal. However, paragraph 2 of the clause appears to authorize an offeror that chose either the mandatory IP or Wireless service to include the OPTIONAL services of the other service in its Enterprise proposal. Therefore, for example, a bidder proposing to offer the mandatory wireless services CAN also include in its proposal the optional IP services identified on Table C.2.1.(b). Conversely, a bidder that selects to offer the mandatory IP services in its proposal CAN also include in its proposal the optional wireless services identified on Table C.2.1.(a). Please confirm that this interpretation is correct. |  |
| 208 | Both        | В              | Tables B.2.6.5.2-2, B.2.6.5.6- Table B.2.6.5.6-2 has a column heading for CCS but Table B.2.5.63 has a heading for CACS instead of CCS Will GSA correct Table B.2.6.5.6-3 so that the column entitled CACS is changed to CCS to be consistent with Table B.2.6.5.6-2?  | In an upcoming amendment, the Government will make sure that the correct abbreviation for Calling Card Services, namely CACS and not CCS, is used throughout Section B.2.6.1 Combined Services (CS). |
| 209 | Both        | В              | Since the pricing tool and traffic model have not been released, when will the Government provide the pricing tool to bidders?   | The complete Networx Hosting Center price engine functionality was made available to offerors on June 4, 2005. Traffic model data was made available to offerors on May 6, 2005.                     |
| 210 | Both        | B.1.2          | In paragraph 7 the government states that contract pricing year 11 prices shal be the same as year ten prices. Why is the contractor not permitted to adjust prices for year 11?   | Contract Year 11, if applicable, will be less than 12 months. The Government wishes to maintain price stability through this period.   |
| 211 | Both        | B.1.2          | The Government states that all NSP items should have a "price of zero (0) entered in the price tables" then goes on to state that a contractor can mark any CLIN "NSP at its discretion". How does the Government intend to differentiate between CLINs that are priced at zero from CLINs that are not separately priced?   | The Government does not differentiate between CLINs that are priced at zero and CLINs that are not separately priced.  |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP         | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|-------------|--|---|
|     | -           | Section     |  |   |
| 212 | Universal   | B.1.3       | The RFP Requires contractors to use the Contract modification date as the Price Replaced Date. This could cause a double submission of the modification since this date is unknown until the contract is fully executed. Would the Government revise its statement to avoid confusion and double submission of each modification? We suggest that the Price Replaced Date be the date that the currently billed rates are no longer billed. For example if the contract modification is executed on 12/15, the price change might be effective on 12/1 or 1/1. In this case, we suggest that 12/1 or 1/1 be the Price Replaced Date, because that date is more certain at the time of the modification submission, while the contract execution date is unknown. | Yes, the modification is proposed with an estimated replaced date. However, when the contract modification is approved by the GSA, the replaced date is changed in the price tables to the modification approval date. This does not require a resubmission on the contractor's part.   |
| 213 | Both        | B.1.3.1.5   |  | The RFP will be amended to read "The type and number of critical CLINs charged shall not depend upon the technological solution employed. For example, even if the contractor's solution for an IPS Critical Service Level requirement employs two access links from the SDP to different POPs to achieve Critical Service Level, only a single critical port charge is permitted. That is, critical performance shall be achieved using the same number of CLINs as routine performance (access excepted), the only difference being that critical rather than routine CLINs shall be employed." |
| 214 | Both        | B.2.5.1.2-6 | Section J.2.2 states, "Non-domestic service coverage is optional." Reference Table clin() on the Networx Hosting Center shows many CLINs in Table B.2.5.1.2-5 PLS Half Channel Pricing Instructions as being mandatory. Examples are CLINs 130101 - 130109. Will the Government update the Reference Table clin() to show PLS Half Channels as being optional?   | The Government will change Section B CLINs in PLS Half Channel Pricing to be optional for agreement with Attachment J.2.2. The Hosting Center will be updated to reflect this change.   |
| 215 | Universal   | B.2.10.1.2  | In Table B .2.10.2-2 (MFS Pricing Instructions), a CLIN has been added for Application Proxy Firewall. This is a specific type of Firewall and should have additional CLINs to represent Application Proxy Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III firewalls. Will GSA add NRC CLINs for each of the Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 firewalls?   | The Government has reviewed the price structure and determined that the CLINs are sufficient.   |
| 216 | Universal   | B.2.10.1.3  | Table B.2.10.1.3-2, Managed Firewall Service Features do not include CLINs for NRC. Will GSA add NRC CLINs for MFS Features?   | The Government has carefully reviewed the price structure and it remains unchanged.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|----------------|--|---|
| 217 | Universal   | B.2.10.1.3-2   | Table B.2.10.1.3-2 identifies the features that are requested for Managed Firewall Service, which requires three separate types of firewall: premise-based firewall, Network-based firewalls, and Application Proxy firewalls. Each firewall is functionally different from the other and will require different hardware and architectures to support. The firewall feature pricing should reflect the three different types of firewalls. Will GSA add the CLINS to support Managed Firewall Services features for each class of firewall?   |   |
| 218 | Universal   |                | Section C.2.10.1.2.1 identifies Personal Firewall as Optional; however, Pricing Table B.2.10.1.3-2 does not indicate that Personal Firewalls are an option. Will GSA modify the pricing table B.2.10.1.3-2 to reflect the requirement that personal firewalls are optional?  | GSA agrees. Table B.2.10.1.3-2 will be changed to have Personal Firewall (CLIN# 309011) labeled as optional.  |
| 219 | Universal   |                | Section C.2.10.2.1.4 identifies the Technical Capabilities associated with the IDPS service. There are not associated CLINs, however, for many of the technical capabilities. For instance the first requirement is to provide design and implementation services. The second requires the installation support to include testing equipment and loading of agency relevant data, as required by the agency. These and many other items in the technical capabilities section should have associated CLINS for the bidders to price the service. It is recommended that the Government revise this section to cover the technical requirements listed in C.2.10.2.1.4. Will GSA add the CLINs that are based on the separate and individual technical requirements for this section? | The Government has carefully reviewed the price structure and will not divide the pricing into multiple CLINs as requested.   |
| 220 | Both        | B.2.10.3       | Under Vulnerability Scanning Service, it is recommended that the Government specify whether the required pricing includes transport or not. Will GSA specify whether the pricing includes transport?   | Reference the last sentence in Section B.2.10.3.1, which states: "Charges for underlying transport services are in addition to the charges specified in this Section." The pricing for VSS does not include any underlying transport costs. |
| 221 | Both        | B.2.10.3.3     | This section requires the contractor to provide the agency the ability to integrate the service into its own tools and applications. There is no associated CLIN for the pricing of this support. There may also be licensing issues with providing the capability on agency servers and computers. Will GSA revise this section to include appropriate CLINS for the pricing of these services?   | The Government has carefully reviewed the price structure and it remains unchanged.   |
| 222 | Both        |                | The Technical Capabilities section identifies all the requirements of the AVMS. It does not appear, however, that the Pricing CLINS in Table B have all the associated CLINS for pricing the service and providing the NRC and MRC pricing. Will GSA add the appropriate CLINs to cover the technical requirements for the AVMS?   | The CLINs in Section B.2.10.4 do not have a corresponding CLIN for each separate technical capability. It is assumed that the CLIN prices will cover all of the technical capabilities in Section C.2.10.4.                                 |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|----------------|---|---|
| 223 | Universal   | B.2.10.4.3     | We recommend that the Government add a CLIN #369001 in table B.2.10.4.3-2 to cover NRC. Will GSA be agreeable to doing this?  | The Government has carefully reviewed the price structure and will not add additional NRC CLINs for AVMS Features.  |
| 224 | Both        | B.2.10.5.2     | This section indicates that the MRC covers the monitoring and management support of the INRS that is provided by the contractor. Section C of the INRS does not identify or specify what the monitoring and management requirements are for INRS. Will GSA define the specific requirements for monitoring and management support for the INRS in Section C of the RFP?   | The specific requirements for monitoring and management support for INRS are in Section C.2.10.5.1.4 Technical Capabilities 2-14.   |
| 225 | Universal   | B.2.10.5.2-4   | The pricing for INRS will require the use of different skill sets and different levels of experience, however, the existing pricing tables do not offer CLINs to enable contractors to provide pricing for different skills with different experience levels. Will GSA incorporate modified CLINS to enable bidders to provide pricing for different skills and levels of experience to support the INRS service? | GSA elects not to change the pricing structure.   |
| 226 | Both        | B.2.10.5.2-4   | This section requires the pricing on Reactive INRS – Unlimited incidents on a per service basis, however, the Government does not define the meaning of "Per Service" in this context. This will provide a clearer understanding of the government's intent and will help bidders provide the most advantageous pricing to the Government. Will GSA define what it means by "Per Service"?                        | The charging unit of "per service" means per unit of INRS service purchased.  |
| 227 | Universal   | B.2.11.10.1    | The government has removed the features table (Draft Table B.2.11.10.3-2) from Storage Services. Will GSA include this table in the final RFP?  | These features have been removed from the requirements in Section C.2.11. The Government will not re-introduce them.  |
| 228 | Universal   | B.2.11.10.1    | Back ups during peak hours could be disruptive to normal business operations occurring on the network. Will GSA establish a peak hour range of, for example, 7am to 6pm EST and include separate CLINS be established for peak hour back ups vs. non-peak hour back ups?  | in C.2.11.10.1.4 Technical Capabilities #4. Additionally, pricing elements for peak/off-peak hours  |
| 229 | Universal   | B.2.11.10.1    | We recommend offering separate pricing to the customer for pushing data to the customer vs. the vendor pulling the data from the customer. Doing so would grant the customer more flexibility. Will GSA be agreeable to adding feature CLINs for this?  | Nothing is stated in the technical section that separates pushing the data to the vendor from pulling the data from the customer. Therefore, separate pricing is not needed for these components. |
| 230 | Both        | B.2.11.11.2    | Will GSA provide a model where the user mailbox storage could be graduated, based on the type of user? Presently, each subscriber is allocated a full 50 MB in the RFP. The shared resource being given for a tiered user community, where only power users have the full 50 MB preallocated, will lower product cost to the GSA.   | No.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP          | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|--------------|--|---|
|     |             | Section      |  |   |
| 231 | Universal   | B.2.11.2.2.1 | The pricing of Contact Center Services depends upon a number of variables that this format does not accommodate. These include the length of the call, the services levels required, the services to be provided (In-bound, out-bound, web chat, email etc) and the skill level of the agent required. The physical location of the facility also may affect the cost. For the Networx IDIQ we would recommend that a typical scenario be established, such as a 3 minute in-bound call with a service level of 80/20 (80 % of the calls being answered in 20 seconds) with a tier 1 agent and the center located in the U.S. Individual cases would be subject to an SOW that would define all of the Agency's requirements and a detailed price quoted on an individual case basis. This would provide the most cost effective solution for all agencies because they would only pay for what they need not for all the services some of which they may not use. The agent skill level, as identified in Section C.11.2.1.5, as well as the additional personnel called for, could also be specified. If this approach is acceptable, will GSA revise the RFP accordingly? |   |
| 232 | Universal   | B.2.11.2.2.3 | In the heading of this section the RFP says "Contractor Based and Agency Provided (Optional)"; however, the table for this section (Table B.2.11.2.2-10) only lists the critical CLINs as being optional. a: Will GSA either remove (optional) from the section heading or add optional to the routine CLINs. b: Will GSA provide clarification as to whether this entire section is optional or just the critical CLINs?  | a. No, the section heading is accurate. b. The CLINs in Table B.2.11.2.2-10 are mandatory unless marked optional. Thus, if an offeror chooses to propose the Contractor Based/Agency Provided option to CCS, then it must propose all the corresponding CLINs that are not marked optional. |
| 233 | Both        |              | The RFP states that the contractor shall provide prices as described in Section B.4 (SEDs) if the Agency determines that contractor-provided devices are in the best interest of the Government. However, this does not take into consideration that a custom solution may require equipment that is not yet available on SEDs tables. Will GSA allow an ICB CLIN in Table B.2.11.9.2-2, CSDES Pricing Instructions, to include an ordering mechanism for equipment not already available in SEDs tables. This will facilitate use of equipment for custom solutions and to help track the equipment that will need to be introduced into the SEDs contract modification process.  |   |
| 234 | Both        | B.2.11.9.2   | The CDES pricing structure described in section B.2.11.9.1 states that CDES services shall be priced ICB. In Table B.2.11.9.2-2, however, the charging unit says NRC/MRC. Will GSA change the charging unit for CLIN 0530201 to read "ICB NRC," and CLIN 0530202 to read "ICB MRC?"  | The RFP will be amended to make the charging units ICB for those CLINS.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP        | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|------------|---|---|
|     |             | Section    |   |   |
| 235 | Both        | B.2.12.1.2 | The RFP states that "Teleworking Services shall connect geographically dispersed teleworkers to and interoperate with: 1. Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN)" The requirements include the origination and termination of calls to and from the PSTN, but the pricing tables in B.2.12.1.2 do not include usage charges. Would GSA agree to allow offerors to propose TWS usage charges for applicable local toll and long distance PSTN usage? | The Government has carefully reviewed the price structure and it remains unchanged.   |
| 236 | Enterprise  | B.2.13.3   | Table B.2.13.3.3-5 Cable speeds are generally expressed in up and down link capabilities, while table B.2.13.3.3-5 only provides for single rate. Q3: Will GSA provide both up and down speeds for cable modem access to assure proper responses by vendor?   | Yes, the Government will provide both uplink and downlink speeds for cable high-speed (modem) access in Section B.2.13.3.3.   |
| 237 | Both        | B.2.14.1   |   | Table 2.14.1.2-7 provides the pricing table for SMS and MMS (Optional) features. Table 2.14.1.2-9 provides the pricing instructions and associated CLINs for MMS (Optional) features. |
| 238 | Both        | B.2.14.1   | Table B.2.14.1.22 The RFP list feature "SMS – Interworking with Instant Messaging (IM)" in Section C under Table C.2.14.1.2.1, CPCS Features, but does not list a corresponding pricing CLIN in Table B.2.14.1.22. Will GSA add a CLIN in Table B.2.14.1.2-2 for the feature "SMS – Interworking with Instant Messaging (IM)," listed in Table C.2.14.1.2.1?  | This is part of SMS capability. Table B.2.14.1.2-8 provides the CLINs for SMS features. The Government will not add the requested CLIN.   |
| 239 | Universal   | B.2.14.3   | Table B.2.14.3.1-2 The RFP has not listed NRC CLINs for this type of service, and that is in conflict with paragraph B.2.14.3.1 on page B-186, which states the pricing components are listed as (1) Recurring Charge for subscription; (2) Non-Recurring Charge for private Hotspot and (3) Monthly Recurring Charge for private Hotspot. Will GSA allow offerors the option of proposing an NRC for this service?                                   |   |
| 240 | Both        | B.2.14.3.1 | A single CLIN, 0670001 is not adequate to describe the pricing options for public WiFi access. Multiple CLINs will be required. Will GSA allow offerors to establish sub-CLINs to describe the pricing options?   | The Government has carefully reviewed the price structure and it remains unchanged.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section                     | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 241 | Both        | B.2.14.5                           | Table B.2.14.5.2-3 The RFP has a misprint on the MRC CLIN for "Up to 500 messages per month," which could confuse offerors. We recommend that this MRC CLIN for "Up to 500 messages per month" should read "0690302" rather than "0690301," as listed in the RFP. Will GSA change the MRC CLIN for "Up to 500 messages per month" from "0690301" to "0690302" to avoid confusing offerors?  | GSA agrees. GSA will amend the RFP to assign CLIN 0690302 to the service labeled "Up to 500 messages per month".   |
| 242 | Universal   | B.2.15.1                           | Table B.2.15.1.2-4 The RFP mandates under Section B.2.15.1.2 that "Table B.2.15.1.2-4 provides applicable charging mechanisms and charging units for domestic MSS usage." Although the CLINs under Table B.2.15.1.2-4 are for Domestic, the table heading states "MSS Non-Domestic Usage Pricing Instructions". We believe that the heading is an error. Will GSA clarify whether the table heading should read as "MSS Domestic Usage Pricing Instructions"?   | The table should read "MSS Domestic Usage Pricing Instructions", and the RFP will be amended accordingly.  |
| 243 | Universal   | B.2.15.1                           | Table B.2.15.1.2-4 This table is labeled as "MSS Non-Domestic Usage Pricing Instructions". However, the description states 'Domestic' for each line item. In addition, the table does not indicate if the CLINs are for MRCs or NRCs. Will GSA clarify if the CLINs are for Domestic locations and if all are for MRCs?   | The RFP will be amended to show that the CLINs are for Domestic locations and are MRCs.  |
| 244 |             | B.2.2.1,<br>B.2.2.2                | The RFP lists instructions and pricing CLINs for Authorization Codes for Voice Services (in Tables C.2.2.1.2.1 (page C-19) and B.2.2.1.4-3 (page B-20) respectively). The RFP again states the requirement for Authorization Codes in the Circuit Switched Data Services section under paragraph C.2.2.2.1.4, item #2 (page C-26), but there is not a corresponding pricing CLIN for Authorization Codes within Table B.2.2.2.4-2 (B-26-27). Does the Government expect bidders to use the Voice CLINs for the Circuit Switched Data Services (CSDS) CLINs or will there be separate CLINs for Authorization Codes for the Features for CSDS (table B.2.2.2.4-2)? Would GSA be agreeable to defining separate CLINs for the feature of Authorization Codes under Table B.2.2.2.4-2? |  |
| 245 |             | B.2.2.1.1.1<br>(Last<br>paragraph) |   | In an upcoming amendment, the wording of the RFPs in Section B.2.2.1.1.1, last paragraph, will changed from "or other wireless devices (i.e., pagers)." to "or other wireless devices (e.g., pagers)." |
| 246 | Universal   | B.2.2.2.3-1                        | In two cells it states "OCONUS Non-Domestic." OCONUS, by definition is Domestic. Please confirm that correct wording is "OCONUS or Non-Domestic.  | In an upcoming amendment, the two entries of "OCONUS Non-Domestic" will changed to conform to the two other entries "OCONUS or Non-Domestic."  |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section                   | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 247 | Universal   | B.2.2.3.4-2                      | For "Real Time Reporting," the table note states: "See Section B.4 for SEDs pricing. For use with Government-provided terminal, includes communications and security software." Will GSA restate the requirement to include the following: "If an SED is required, refer to Section B.4 for SEDs pricing"?  | The Government has carefully reviewed this provision and it remains unchanged.  |
| 248 | Both        | B.2.3.1.2                        | The RFP states "Dial-up access uses an independent service and is not covered in this section." Toll free service can't be ordered by the agency, to use with dial-to-Frame. Please clarify that this reference is to calls that are "sender paid."   | Yes, the questioner is correct in its assumption.   |
| 249 | Both        |                                  | In table B.2.3.1-10, are "simplex" PVC's to be thought of as uni-directional? Are "duplex" then to be considered as bi-directional? Also, how will the government select amongst a large range of CIR values within UFR with only 4 UFR PVC CLIN's (0044801, 0044401, 0044601, 0044801)?  | A simplex channel is a one-way channel. A duplex channel is one that can carry information in both directions. Using Table B.2.3.1.3-10, a desired PVC CIR speed is ordered by ordering multiple quantities of a CLIN. For example, to order 1024 kps UFR, Routine Service Level, Simplex PVC, 16 of CLIN 0044201 must be ordered (1024kps = 16xDS0). |
| 250 | Both        | B.2.3.1.3-2                      | Will GSA make 384K ISDN optional in Table B.2.3.1.3-2? This would align the Technical and Pricing requirements, as 384K ISDN is optional in section C.2.3.1.2.1(7).   | In an upcoming amendment, the Government will make 384K ISDN optional in Table B.2.3.1.3-2.   |
| 251 |             | B.2.3.1.3-9<br>&<br>C.2.3.1.2.1  | Table B.2.3.1.3-9 is labeled FRS Unspecified Frame Relay PVC Prices, but the following table specifies three types of FRS PVCs: UFR, VFRnrt and VFRrt. Would GSA delete UFR from the heading of Table B.2.3.1.3-9 and make UFR and VFRrt optional types of service in both the technical and pricing sections?  | The Government requires all three types of PVCs.  |
| 252 | Both        | B.2.3.1.4-2                      | Will GSA make the Voice over Frame Relay pricing optional in Table B.2.3.1.4 - 2? This would align the Technical and Pricing requirements since the Voice over Frame Relay is optional in Section C.2.3.1.2.1 (8).  | In an upcoming amendment, the Government will make the Voice over Frame Relay pricing optional in Table B.2.3.1.4-2. to align it with Section C.  |
| 253 |             | B.2.3.1.4-2<br>& B.2.3.2.4-<br>2 | Please clarify that the Frame Relay-to-Internet Gateway feature, priced per PVC, per month, is an additional feature charge on top of the standard PVC price, so that the total price can reflect the ordered speed of the FR-to-Internet Gateway PVC.  | The Frame Relay-to-Internet Gateway feature, priced per PVC, per month, is an additional feature charge on top of the standard PVC price; yielding the total price for the Frame Relay-to-Internet Gateway PVC.   |
| 254 | Both        | B.2.3.2                          | Table B.2.3.2.3-2, Table B.2.3.2.3-4, Table B.2.3.2.3-6, Table B.2.3.2.3-8, Table B.2.3.2.3-10, Table B.2.3.2.3-12, Table B.2.3.2.3-13 The RFP has not listed NRC CLINs for these types of services. We recommend that GSA allow NRC CLINs. Doing so would be consistent with commercial practice and would benefit the Government, as it allows for pricing flexibility. Will GSA allow bidders the option of proposing an NRC for these services? | The Government has carefully reviewed the price structure and it remains unchanged.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|----------------|---|--|
| 255 | Both        | B.2.3.2.3-8    | Will GSA make ABR class of service optional? ABR service is not generally commercially offered throughout industry.   | No. The Government has carefully reviewed this requirement and it remains unchanged.   |
| 256 | Both        | B.2.4.1        | The RFP mandates under Section B.2.4.1.1 that "The price structure for domestic and non-domestic IPS shall comprise the following elements: a. Monthly Recurring Charge per port; b. Non-Recurring Charge per port; c. Feature Charges." All the pricing tables for domestic and non-domestic in this section, however, are missing Routine and Critical NRC CLINs. These tables are as follows: B.2.4.1.3.1-2 IPS Domestic Port Pricing Instruction – Intranet/Extranet; B.2.4.1.3.1-4 IPS Domestic Port Pricing Instruction – Internet; B.2.4.1.3.2-2 IPS Non-Domestic Port Pricing Instruction – Internet. We recommend that the government include for each line item of the domestic and non-domestic IPS Port Tables Routine and Critical NRC CLINs. This will provide consistency to the requirement and mirrors commercial practice. Will GSA agree to including on all the domestic and non-domestic IPS Port tables Routine and Critical NRC CLINs for each line? |  |
| 257 | Universal   | B.2.4.1        | Table B.2.4.1.3.1-2 There seems to be duplicate CLINs for Independent SDSL under IPS Domestic Port Pricing Instructions - Intranet/Extranet table. Hence, we believe CLIN 0744048 through 0744049 and 0744217 through 0744218 should read as "CONUS" rather than "OCONUS." Would the Government clarify whether these CLINs should be for CONUS?  | Yes, these CLINs should be labeled as CONUS. The Government will change the description for CLINs 0744048 and 0744217 from "Independent – SDSL (at 768 kbps / 768 kbps) – OCONUS" to "Independent – SDSL (at 768 kbps / 768 kbps) – CONUS." Also, the Government will change the description for CLINs 0744049 and 0744218 from "Independent – SDSL (at 1.54 Mbps / 1.54 Mbps) – OCONUS" to "Independent – SDSL (at 1.54 Mbps / 1.54 Mbps) – CONUS." |
| 258 | Universal   | B.2.5          | Table B.2.5.2.2-4, Table B.2.5.2.2-11, Table B.2.5.2.3-2, Table B.2.5.3.2-2, Table B.2.5.3.2.1-2, Table B.2.5.4.2-4, Table B.2.5.4.2-5, Table B.2.5.4.3-2, Table B.2.5.4.3-3 The RFP has not listed NRC CLINs for these types of services as was done previously in the draft. We recommend that the Government allow NRC CLINs. Doing so would be consistent with commercial practice and would benefit the Government, as it allows for pricing flexibility. Will GSA allow bidders the option of proposing an NRC for these services?  |  |
| 259 | Both        | B.2.5.1.2.2    | Pricing Instruction Tables are missing for CONUS and OCONUS Transport thus there are no CLIN numbers provided. Please provide pricing instruction tables for CONUS and OCONUS Transport.  | Table B.2.5.1.2-5 and Table B.2.5.1.2-6 provide Pricing Instructions in conjunction with the use of the originating and terminating Country/Jurisdiction IDs.  |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|----------------|---|---|
| 260 | Both        | B.2.5.1.2-6    | Will GSA make OC-1 and OC-1 Full Channel pricing Optional? This will align Technical and Pricing requirements, as well as align Pricing requirements between Sections B.2.5.1.2-5 and B.2.5.1.2-6.  | Yes, the Government will make the change in an upcoming amendment.  |
| 261 | Universal   | B.2.5.2.2      | Table B.2.5.2.2-2, Table B.2.5.2.2-7 The RFP has not listed NRC CLINs for this type of service as was done previously in the draft. We recommend that bidders be allowed the option to propose a NRC for this type of service. Will GSA allow bidders the option of proposing an NRC for these services?  | At this time the Government does not consider there is a need for NRC CLINs for the items in question.  |
| 262 | Both        | B.2.5.2.2.1    | Table B.1.2-1 indicates that the CLIN prefix is 015; the CLIN prefix in the SONET Section is 154. Please update the CLINS in the SONET Section to match Table B.1.2-1.  | The CLINs will be updated to reflect the correct number in an upcoming amendment.   |
| 263 | Universal   | B.2.5.2.3-2    | Table B.2.5.2.3-2 The RFP lists an optional Feature of "Bandwidth on Demand" in Table C.2.5.2.2.1, SONETS Services Features, but does not have a corresponding CLIN associated with this Feature in Table B.2.5.2.3-2. We recommend that the government provide a CLIN for the Bandwidth on Demand feature in Table B.2.5.2.3-2, SONETS Feature Pricing Instructions, in order to provide pricing for this optional service consistent with what is stated in Table C.2.5.2.2.1. Will GSA add a CLIN for the Feature "Bandwidth on Demand" in Table B.2.5.2.3-2 to correspond with the requirement listed in Table C.2.5.2.2.1? | Section B.2.5.2.2.2 SONETS Transport – Bandwidth on Demand (BoD) covers this item. There is no need for additional CLINs.   |
| 264 | Universal   | B.2.5.2.3-2    | Table B.2.5.2.3-2 The RFP mandates pricing for CLIN 159003 "DS1 Rate Synchronization Service" but lists this feature as optional in Table C.2.5.2.2.1. We recommend CLIN 159003 be consistent with Table C.2.5.2.2.1 as an optional feature in order to avoid confusing bidders. Will GSA restate CLIN 159003 as an optional feature to be consistent with its identity as an optional feature in Table C.2.5.2.2.1?  | In an upcoming amendment, the Government will restate CLIN 159003 as an optional feature to be consistent with its identity as an optional feature in Table C.2.5.2.2.1.      |
| 265 | Both        | B.2.5.2.3-2    | Will GSA make CLIN 159002, DS1 Rate Synchronization Service, optional? This would align technical and pricing sections, as Section C.2.5.2.2.1 has DS1 Rate Synchronization Service as optional.  | In an upcoming amendment, the Government will make CLIN 159002, DS1 Rate Synchronization Service, optional to align with Section C.   |
| 266 | Both        | B.2.5.3.2      | Will GSA make all DFS pricing be ICB? This will allow Agencies to negotiate DFS pricing at time of purchase.  | No. The Government wishes to have fixed prices for DFS.   |
| 267 | Both        | B.2.5.4.2-5    | Will GSA make all CLINs in the table optional? This would align technical and pricing sections, as Section C.2.5.2 is listed as optional.   | The Government assumes the respondent is referring to Section C.2.5.4.2 rather than C.2.5.2. The Government will mark Table B.2.5.4.2-5 as optional in an upcoming amendment. |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP                    | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|------------------------|---|---|
| 268 | Universal   | Section<br>B.2.5.4.3-2 | Table B.2.5.4.3-2 The RFP mandates pricing for CLIN 0179012 "Protected Non-Domestic Wavelength" but lists this feature as optional in Table C.2.5.4.1.2.1, OWS over WDM Features. We recommend that CLIN 0179012 be re-identified as an optional feature to be consistent with Table C.2.5.4.1.2.1 and preclude confusion on the part of bidders. Will GSA rename CLIN 0179012 as an optional feature?  | In an upcoming amendment, the Government will rename CLIN 0179012 as an optional feature. |
| 269 | Universal   | B.2.5.4.3-2            | Table B.2.5.4.3-2 The RFP mandates pricing for CLIN 0179013 "Protected CONUS Wavelength" but lists this feature as optional in Table C.2.5.4.1.2.1, OWS over WDM Features. We recommend that CLIN 0179013 be re-identified as an optional feature in order to be consistent with Table C.2.5.4.1.2.1 and avoid confusing bidders. Will GSA rename CLIN 0179013 as an optional feature?  | Yes, the Government will rename this as an optional CLIN to be consistent with Section C. |
| 270 | Universal   | B.2.5.4.3-3            | Table B.2.5.4.3-3 The RFP mandates pricing for CLIN 0179031 "Customer Network Management (CNM) – Level 3," but does not list this CLIN in Section C under Table C.2.5.4.2.2.1, OWS over ASTN Features. We recommend that CLIN 0179031 have a corresponding feature and description in Table C.2.5.4.2.2.1 to ensure proper pricing for it. Will GSA add the feature with its description in Table C.2.5.4.2.2.1, to correspond with CLIN 0179031?   |   |
| 271 | Universal   | B.2.5.4.3-3            | Table B.2.5.4.3-3 The RFP has not listed a corresponding CLIN for the "Planning Tools Support" feature, which is to be priced as "per server license per user," as was included in the RFP draft. We recommend that bidders be allowed the option to propose a price "per server license per user" for the "Planning Tools Support" feature, as this is a separately charged feature in the industry. Will GSA include a CLIN that would allow offerors the option of proposing a price "per server license per user" for the "Planning Tools Support" feature? |   |
| 272 | Both        | B.2.7.10.2             | Paragraph C.2.7.10.1.4 Subparagraph 1 states that "The contractor shall provide capabilities that shall enable IPTelS subscribers to successfully establish and receive telephone calls between both on-net locations and the PSTN." The requirements include the origination and termination of calls to and from the PSTN, but the pricing tables in B.2.7.10.2 do not include usage charges. Would GSA be agreeable to allowing bidders to propose IPTelS usage charges for applicable local toll and long distance PSTN usage?                              |   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|----------------|---|--|
| 273 | Both        | B.2.7.11.1     | The price structure mandated for CIPS Basic Service does not include Non-Recurring Charge. Hence, Table B.2.7.11.2-2 includes CLINs for MRC only. Will GSA revise the price structure for CIPS Basic Service to include Non-Recurring Charge and provide NRC CLINs?   | The Government has carefully reviewed the price structure and it remains unchanged.  |
| 274 | Both        | B.2.7.11.2     | Section C.2.7.11.1.4, Subparagraph 5, states that "The contractor shall provide gateways and/or service enabling devices, where required, (a) for protocol conversions, (b) to interface with the contractor's CIPS network or (c) for access to external networks. External networks shall include the Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and Internet." The requirements include the origination and termination of calls to and from the PSTN, but the pricing tables in B.2.7.11.2 do not include usage charges. Will GSA agree to allow offerors to propose CIPS usage charges for applicable local toll and long distance PSTN usage? | Domestic offnet usage charges shall be provided as part of the MRC for each domestic telephone number receiving telephony service.   |
| 275 | Both        | B.2.7.11.2-2   | Table B.2.7.11.2-2 CIPS Port Prices tables for CONUS and OCONUS have been provided; however, the associated CLINs provided on Table B.2.7.11.2-2 do not differentiate CONUS from OCONUS. We recommend that GSA provide separate CLINs for CONUS and OCONUS locations. This will provide consistency to the requirement and will allow Government CONUS customers not to be burdened with potentially higher costs from OCONUS locations. In addition, it allows bidders to recoup costs if there should be such a variance. Will GSA provide separate CLINs for CONUS and OCONUS?   | Separate CLINs are not required for CONUS, OCONUS, and Non-Domestic prices. The same CLIN can be used with different Country/Jurisdiction IDs (or none in the case of CONUS) to refer to different prices. |
| 276 | Both        | B.2.7.12.2     | The RFP states that access shall be a separate charge. Is GSA referring to Section B.3 which provides for dedicated access pricing?   | Yes.   |
| 277 | Both        | B.2.7.2.4      | Table B.2.7.2.4-2 The charging unit for CLIN 0209001 is ICB but the RFP does not identify ICB for MRC and/or NRC. We recommend that GSA allow MRC and NRC CLINs for this feature, in keeping with commercial practice. Will GSA allow offerors the option of proposing an ICB MRC & NRC for this service?   |  |
| 278 | Both        | B.2.7.2.4-2    | There are six Security services in B.2.10. Is it the contractor's responsibility to load the appropriate CLINs from other sections? Or can we simply note that those CLINs are found in the other sections?   | The CLINs do not need to be loaded, as they are to be found in the sections referenced.  |

| .#  | Acquisition | RFP         | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|-------------|--|--|
| #   | Acquisition | Section     | Redacted Question  | Redacted Allswei   |
| 279 | Universal   | B.2.7.3.3   | All of the NBIP-VPNS Transport tables do not include CLINs for NRC. These tables are the following: B.2.7.3.3-2 NBIP-VPNS Port Pricing Instructions (CONUS); B.2.7.3.3-3 NBIP-VPNS Port Pricing Instructions (OCONUS); B.2.7.3.3-4 NBIP-VPNS Port Pricing Instructions (Non-Domestic). We recommend that the government include NRC CLINs for each line item of the NBIP-VPNS Transport. Doing so would be consistent with commercial practice and would benefit the Government, as it allows pricing flexibility. Will GSA revise all the NBIP-VPNS Transport tables to include NRC CLINs for each line item? | No change is required.   |
| 280 | Universal   | B.2.7.3.4-2 | Table B.2.7.3.4-2 Class of Service (CoS) Premium, Enhance and Standard are reflected twice under Table B.2.7.3.4-2. We believe this is a typographical error. If this is true, would GSA modify the table and take out the double entries?   | In an upcoming amendment, the Government will fix remove the duplicate entries.  |
| 281 | Universal   | B.2.7.9     | Section C.2.7.9 indicates IP Video Transport Service (IPVTS) as Optional, however, Section B.2.7.9 does not indicate IPVTS as an optional service. Will GSA revise Section B.2.7.9 to state that IPVTS is an optional service?   | Table B.1.2-1 indicates IPVTS as Optional.   |
| 282 | Universal   | B.2.7.9.1   | CLIN 0240103 (IPVTS – high bandwidth) covers mandatory bandwidth (512 kbps and up to and including 768 kbps) as well as optional bandwidths (1.544 Mbps and 1.92 Mbps). We recommend that the government provide separate CLINs for 1.544 Mbps and 1.92 Mbps. Will GSA provide separate CLINs for the optional bandwidths: 1.544 Mbps and 1.92 Mbps?   | The Government desires the same price for each of the high bandwidth services: 512 kbps through 1.92 Mbps (1.544 and 1.92 Mbps optional).  |
| 283 | Both        | B.2.7.9.2-2 | The VTS Port Pricing Table lists an extensive list of Dial-In, Dial-Out, and Dedicated Port options. These same options should be available for an IP VTS user to give them the same options. Mirroring this table will be advantageous to the government in giving them those same options. Should Table B.2.7.9.2 IPVTS Pricing mirror the contents of Table B.2.8.1.2-2 VTS Port Pricing?   | No. IPVTS provides a subset of VTS servicesthose applying to users on a common IP network. If broader VTS services are required to bring in users on different types of networks or dial-in/out, VTS service should be used.   |
| 284 | Both        | B.2.7.9.2-2 | Should the contractor assume that IPVTS Service CLINs in Section B.2.7.9.2 would only be used when a user wants to initiate a video conference and that user has IP. That user would then order transport from the appropriate IP Tables, IP VTS Service from the B.2.7.9.2-2 Table, and any associated Features from B.2.7.9.3-2? The assumption is there will be no need to any additional items from the VTS Section.   | The vendor's assumptions are correct. IPVTS can be initiated by anyone using the vendor's IP service. Any participant outside that network would then connect through a gateway provided through features provided by Table B.2.7.9.3-2. VTS services are not necessary. |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP       | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|-----------|---|--|
|     |             | Section   |   |  |
| 285 | Universal   | B.2.8.2.3 | 1 ''  | No. The secure audio conference requirement and associated key synchronization process prices are covered under the feature CLIN 269009 (Secured Audio Conference). No additional CLINs are necessary.   |
| 286 | Both        | B.3       | Table B.3.3-6 This table contains pricing for E-1 and E-3 services which are non-domestic services. Q6: Will GSA consider correct table B.3.3-6 and place requirements for E-1 and E-3 service under Table B.3.3-5?   | Table B.3.3-6 should be titled "Broadband Wireless Access Pricing Instructions". The CLINs in this table apply for tables B.3.3-2 through B.3.3-5, as appropriate. The RFP will be amended to reflect this correction.   |
| 287 | Both        | B.3.2.2   | Table B.3.2.2-5 MRC Routine CLIN 0760354 (NMLI Ethernet LAN Port – 10Gbps) and MRC Routine CLIN 0760358 (NMLI Data Channel – 10 Gbps) are not marked as 'Optional' while the corresponding NRC CLINs for both are. We believe this is an error. Will GSA clarify that both CLIN 0760354 and 0760358 are indeed 'Optional'?  | This was corrected in Amendment 1.   |
| 288 | Both        | B.4.1     | The final paragraph in Section B.4.1 states: "all equipment needed within the contractor's network to provide servicewithin the contractor's backbone network as part of the services and shall not be separately priced as a SED. " Section J.5.2 lists service-specific requirements Sets 48 and 49, OWS and SONET, which are within the contractor's network to provide service. Will GSA remove sets 48 and 49 for this reason? | The Government believes that the kinds of CPE defined in Requirement Sets 48 and 49 are potential Networx SEDs for use with Agency networks and will not be removed from Attachment J.5.   |
| 289 | Both        | B.6       | There are no CLINs to allow pricing should a gateway be required between the incumbent contractor network and the new contractor network. Will GSA include a feature and associated MRC CLIN in Section B.6 if a gateway is required between the incumbent contractor network and the new contractor network?   | After review, the Government will not change the pricing structure.  |
| 290 | Universal   | С         | Table C.2.2.1.3.1 ANSI Standard T1.106 is listed as a requirement in a number of locations, however, it is an obsolete standard that has been replaced by ANSI Standard T1.105.06 (SONET: Physical Layer Specifications). Q3. Will GSA amend the RFP to replace the T1.106 standard requirement with the updated T1.105.06 standard wherever it occurs?   | No. The RFP has cited SONET root standards as "ANSI T1.105 and 106 for SONET" with the additional requirement that the contractor add "[a]II new versions, amendments, and modifications to the above documents and standards when offered commercially" as it is expected that some documents may become obsolete and new ones may be introduced within the lifetime of the contract. |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section        | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 291 | Enterprise  | C.1                   | past industry briefings and correspondence. However, the RFP does not define   | The Networx program goals described in past briefings are the Government's objectives for the Networx Program. These have been included in Attachment J.1 of both Networx RFPs. Section C.1.1 of the Networx Universal RFP and Section C.1.1 of the Networx Enterprise RFP also describe specific objectives for each individual acquisition.  |
| 292 | Both        | C.1.3                 | Paragraph C.1.3 of both RFPs requires that the Contractor provide a proposal where the Government requests service even though the Contractor doesn't provide commercial service to that location. Can only GSA make such a reques or can an ordering agency make the request? Are vendors required to provide a proposal? What will the Government do if it fails to receive an offer it deems fair and reasonable?   | ·  |
| 293 |             | C. 2.8.1.1.4<br>(13b) | In C. 2.8.1.1.4 (13b) VT users are allowed to cancel a conference up to the scheduled start time. Would the Government please change this to be consistent with Section B. 2.8.1.2?  | In an upcoming amendment, the reference to "set up time" in section B.2.8.1.2 will be changed to "start time" to be consistent with Section C.2.8.1.2  |
| 294 | Universal   | C.16.2.4              | Section B.3.4 indicates Satellite Access Arrangement (SatAA) is optional; however, Section C.2.16.2.4 does not indicate that SatAA is an option. Would the Government redefine SatAA as an option to conform to B.3.4?   | SatAA is mandatory in Networx Universal. The Networx Universal RFP will be amended to remove "(Optional") in the Section B.3.4 header.   |
| 295 | Both        | C.2.1.3.1             | When the contractor is responsible for verifying the appropriateness of existing inside wire/cabling, is it correct that the Government will supply all existing information regarding such inside wire/cabling? When the contractor is directed to procure the inside wire/cabling from a third-party supplier, is it correct that the agency personnel with responsibility for the contract with such third party supplier will ensure cooperation by that third party supplier? This clause indicates that when requested by the agency, the contractor shall provide premises wiring/cabling from the standard commercial demarcation to the designated SDP location. Is there a separate charge for this? Is it priced on an ICB basis? | The contractor is responsible for verifying that existing wiring/cabling meets the technical standards for the services ordered in accordance with Section C.2.1.3, Premises Wiring/Cabling. The Government will support the contractor in making this determination and will provide pertinent information if available. When the contractor is directed to procure the inside wire/cabling from a third-party supplier, the agency will support the contractor in coordinating with this supplier; and the contractor may be compensated for its services in accordance with Section B.6.9, Premises Wiring/Cabling Coordination Prices and Installation Charges. If the contractor is requested by the agency to install premises wiring/cabling, it may be compensated in accordance with Section B.6.9, which allows use of ICB prices. |
| 296 |             | C.2.10.6.1.4.<br>2.1  | What is GSA's intended use for the diameter protocol in this service?  | The intended use of the Diameter ( IETF RFC 3588) protocol in the Token-Based Implementation for the Managed E-Authentication Service (MEAS) is for Authentication, Authorization and Accounting (AAA) as stated in Item #6 Section C.2.10.6.1.4.2.1.  |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section          | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| 297 |             | C.2.10.6.1.4.<br>2.1    | Will GSA clarify whether this service includes managing GSA's existing Radius and TACACS servers?   | The Technical Capabilities for the service include: Design and Engineering Services (see Section C.2.10.6.1.4.1), Token-Based Implementation (see Section C.2.10.6.1.4.2.1), and Token-Based Management (see Section C.2.10.6.1.4.2.2). Whether the management of existing RADIUS and TACACS servers for a particular Agency, such as GSA, would be transitioned to a Networx contractor is a Agency-specific post-award decision. |
| 298 |             | C.2.10.6.1.4.<br>3.2    | Will GSA clarify whether this requirement pertains to administrative logins? If not, passwords for private keys are not managed by the Certification Authority.   | Yes. The passwords are for administrative logins by Agency designated points of contact (POCs).  |
| 299 |             | C.2.14.1.2.1<br>(ID 15) | Generally commercially available voice activated dialing solutions are phone-based rather than network based. Will GSA accept phone-based solutions and revise the section language to allow for the alternative solution? Network-based solutions would require the user to first connect to the network, as well as require the network to recognize all users' contact lists, which could imply costly data storage and retrieval network devices. | Voice-Activated Dialing (Network-based) is an optional feature. No change will be made to the RFP.   |
| 300 | Enterprise  | C.2.5.1.1.4             | The implementation and availability of OC-1 interface is not an industry standard. An optical DS-3 interface is based on STS-1. Will the Government consider deleting requirements for OC-1 interface and replacing it by Optical DS 3 interface?   | No. For Enterprise, SONET OC1 bandwidth and associated UNIs (SONET OC1 and STS-1/EC-1) are already defined as optional.  |
| 301 |             | C.2.5.2.1.4<br>(9)      | Is this requirement specific vendor equipment, or does the government require synchronization to be provided to GFE via External and Line Timing?   | GSA expects that vendors offering SONET services be able to support synchronization to GFE if the subscribing Agency requires it. The synchronization methods required are expressed in Section C.2.5.2.1.4 (9).   |
| 302 | Both        | C.2.7.8.1.4             | C.2.7.8.1.4 - #10 Do you require that contractor query the ENUM database and convert dialed numbers to IP addresses or vice-versa?  | Yes.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP         | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|-------------|--|--|
|     |             | Section     |  |  |
| 303 | Enterprise  | C.3.2.2.1.4 |  |  |
| 304 | Both        | C.3.2.2.1.6 | The RFP states that the CPO shall have the capability and authority to "resolve interoperability problems." Some interoperability problems may have a root cause that is outside the control of the CPO or the Contractor. Will GSA modify this requirement to "coordinate resolution of interoperability problems"? | interoperability issues. The contractor will be the single point of authority for the resolution of  |
| 305 | Enterprise  | C.3.2.2.10  | ž  | This is a shared responsibility between the Networx contractors and Telcordia. The contractor is responsible for ensuring the correct address is entered into the system in order to receive the correct Network Site Codes, and Telcordia is responsible for providing the correct Network Site Code based on the address provided. The contractor is responsible for ensuring the correct service and contract is entered into the system in order to receive the correct Networx Inventory Code, and Telcordia is responsible for providing the right code. The contractor will work with Telcordia to ensure the Networx Inventory Code accurately defines the location, service and contract. |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP         | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|-------------|--|---|
|     |             | Section     |  |   |
| 306 | Enterprise  | C.3.2.2.10  | typical that Telcordia charge a per CLLI Code assignment fee to the requesting contractor for any new CLLI codes it generates and maintains. Once generated, it is our understanding that the CLLI Code then becomes reusable by any contractor subscribing to the Telcordia CLONES database. In addition, this contractor understands that the Telcordia Network CLLI code structure does not seem to correlate to the Government's requirement for FTS-Networx that the last 3 characters equate to the contract and service type. This could mean that potentially every existing FTS2001 SDP ID Code may need to be replicated as a Telcordia CLLI Code using the FTS-Networx RFP proposed structure, resulting in significant costs to the contractors in order to initiate   | 1. The Networx Inventory Code will be unique to services delivered under Networx contracts and will not be the same as other 11-character codes Telcordia provides. While the solution is still under design, Networx contractors can expect to enter into new agreements with Telcordia to access the Networx-specific solution. 2. The Government expects to have created the Networx Inventory Codes for all the existing SDP IDs from the FTS2001 contracts prior to contract award of Networx. Naturally, the "contract" portion of the code will not reflect a Networx contract code, and as those services are transitioned to Networx contracts, the providers of the services under Networx will have to acquire contract-appropriate Networx Inventory Codes. 3. Due to the unique nature of the Networx Inventory Codes, all Networx contractors will have to acquire the codes under common circumstances. Therefore, the Government will not provide a CLIN for recovering the costs of obtaining Networx Inventory Codes. |
|     |             |             | transition. 1. How does the government anticipate the existing 11 character Telcordia Network CLLI Codes will be modified to provide the formatting per the government's specifications? 2. Has the Government contracted separately with Telcordia to replicate their existing FTS2001 SETA generated SDP ID Codes to conform to the requirements for Networx Inventory Code? a. If no, does the government plan to enter into an agreement with Telcordia prior to award to generate new CLLIs which map to the Networx specifications? b. If no, does the government plan to enter into an agreement with Telcordia prior to award to convert all existing FTS2001 SDP ID codes to the proper format that map to the Networx specifications? 3. If the contractor finds that a Telcordia Network CLLI Code does not exist or the structure of such code does not correlate to the FTS-Networx Inventory Code specifications and it is determined that a new CLLI Code is needed for a site, will the government provide a CLIN on the contract in order for the contractor to recover any fees for registering the new CLLI with Telcordia? |   |
| 307 | Both        | C.3.3.3.2.2 | Step 2, Step 3 Would the government clarify what priorities the PMO will set? Is this in reference to restoration of service priority? If so, will the government also clarify how this will impact TSP?   | As stated in the RFP, "the PMO will set priorities for Networx services users." Depending on the nature of the disaster, and the agencies that are impacted by the disaster, GSA may be required to focus on getting services restored to some agencies ahead of other agencies, or for restoring some service ahead of others. This requirement does not apply to TSP.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP                 | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|---------------------|---|---|
| 77  | Acquisition | Section             | Redacted Question   | Redacted Allswei  |
| 308 |             | C.3.3.3.3<br>Step 2 | Summary of Contract Requirements, including Government dependencies and assumptions regarding Government Services, facilities, and personnel. This requirement is within the PMP which has a 50 page or fewer limit. Is it the Government's intent for the contractor to update the PMP upon a award with the summary of contract requirements (post negotiations)? Or Please describe what the governments expectations for contractors to deliver Summary of Contract Requirements, including Government dependencies and assumptions | addresses (e.g., Universal) and the implications for the Government on how you plan on providing program management. It should be updated, per the Deliverable Item Description, if changes result from post award negotiations.  |
| 309 | Both        | C.3.4.3.2.4         | The RFP states, "The contractor shall provide restricted access on the Networx Subscriber Website to Transition data." What does GSA consider "Transition data?"  | Transition data is the data cited in Section C.4.3.3 Contractor Data Provided to Government including inventory data, transition action notices, and Go/No-Go notices. For Transition orders, the transition inventory data is expected to include the transition order elements as specified in C.4.3.2 and any additional information collected by the contractor that is needed to complete the installation of the replacement Networx service. |
| 310 | Both        | C.3.4.5.2.2         | These items do not appear in Section J Tables. Please clarify whether Stipulated or Narrative Requirements.   | The items appear in Table J.9.1.2.2 (b) Management Stipulated Service-Specific Requirements, IDs 8 and 9.   |
| 311 | Both        | C.3.5.1.3.4.3<br>.4 | The RFP has identified duplicate status codes, as shown below: R = Received V = Being Validated C = Confirmed R = Rejected P = Being Provisioned I = Implemented A = Accepted D = Disconnected X = Cancelled. "R" is used to designate both Received and Rejected orders. Would GSA assign a unique status code, such as "N" (Not Accepted) for rejected orders?  | The RFPs will be amended to change the Order Status code for Rejection to "RJ".   |
| 312 | Universal   | C.3.6               | Under what conditions, if any, can an AHC for a particular agency change?   | When a Department/Agency is formed or moved to a different Department, the AHC can change. Ar example is the recent formation of the Department of Homeland Security and the movement of bureaus from their current department (say Justice) to the new Department of Homeland Security.  |
| 313 | Both        | C.3.6.1.2.7         | C.3.6.1.2.7 (ID Number 2) requires the contractor to provide archived information and data "in a format acceptable to the Government" within 5 business days of a request. Does the Government consider "acceptable format as the same format as the original submission?   | The Government expects the format to be in compliance with the guidelines specified within the RFP. The guidelines specified in the RFP will remain in effect throughout the life of the contract, upon contract completion, unless a change or modification is agreed on and executed by the Government and the Contractor.  |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP                  | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|----------------------|---|--|
|     |             | Section              |   |  |
| 314 | Both        | C.3.7.2.2            | This section states: "The contractor shall make all class room training available, at no cost to the Government for up to the following number of students" However, offering classroom training is an expensive endeavor. There is no incentive for the Government to provide space for classroom training, which forces the offeror to price ALL classroom training at off-site rates (at least 262 classes) and spread this cost across the entire bid. In order to lower the overall cost of training to the Government, will GSA accept that a pricing section be provided to cover the facilities cost of off-site training, with the understanding that Government-site class room training would continue to be free?   |  |
| 315 |             | C.4.1 &<br>C.4.1.1.5 | Section C.4.1 of the RFP states, "Transition is the process for the coordinated transfer of service from a specified GSA FTS incumbent contractor, such as FTS2001, Crossover, and FTS satellite service and wireless contracts, to a Networx contract." Whereas Section C.4.1.1.5 states, "Transition Orders are orders placed by an Agency to obtain Networx services intended to replace services provided by an incumbent contractor" Please clarify the definition of transition. Does it pertain to the movement to Networx of services currently provided under only existing GSA FTS contracts, or does it also apply to services provided to an Agency not currently supported by GSA FTS contracts? Is there a difference to GSA between Transition versus migration versus implementation? |  |
| 316 | Both        | C.4.2.3              | Is it correct to interpret that an ALTP will be requested only after an Agency has placed an order for transition of services? That assessment is based upon the inclusion of, "for all Transition Orders the Agency has placed." (emphasis added)  | The interpretation is correct. A Contractor will only need to prepare the Agency-Level Transition Plan (ALTP) described in this section after the Agency has made the Fair Opportunity decision for all or some sub-set of their services and has selected that Contractor. If the agency has not actually placed the orders, they will need to provide the contractor with the types and quantities of services to be ordered so that these can be addressed by the ALTP. |
| 317 | Enterprise  | E.1                  | The RFP indicates that equipment should be new. Will the Government consider OEM remanufactured equipment?  | Yes. The Government takes no position regarding the contractor's use of new or OEM remanufactured equipment. Networx is a service contract with SEDs available to users on either a one-time charge basis or a fixed term monthly recurring charge basis. The contractor remains fully responsible for achieving the performance metrics for any service and for the performance of the SED.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|----------------|--|---|
| 318 | Both        | E.5            | Paragraph 3 of this clause states that the contractor shall provide the government with access to the contractors site and all systems necessary to resolve the problem. Will the Government modify this clause as followsthe Government will have access to the contractor's CSO and all systems specifically supporting this contract? This would protect the contractor's systems that are not specifically related to work performed under the contract. | No. The Government believes the present language is appropriate.  |
| 319 | Enterprise  | Entire RFP     | Please provide all future amendments in Word 2003 since that is the software required for proposal submission to the Government.   | The Government uses Adobe files for the transmission of Networx RFPs/amendments because Adobe is more stable than Word. Since the Government is making large files available to multiple offerors for proposal purposes, the files must be precise. Configuration control is an important consideration in selecting a transmission medium.   |
| 320 | Enterprise  | Entire RFP     | Please provide a copy of the final RFP in Word 2003 since that is the software required for proposal submission to the Government.   | The final RFP was released in PDF format because of numerous issues with Word regarding format changes, automatic renumbering, and other problems associated with processing the files on different computers. The Government intends to maintain the PDF files as the baseline for proposal references, amendments, etc. An exception is Section J.9 where the files are provided in Word in order to enable Offerors to enter responses directly into the tables. Copying portions of the PDF files and pasting into the Offeror's Word document is acceptable where direct quotes from the RFP are desirable.  |
| 321 | Both        | G.1.1.1        | In the discussion of the Agency's Role, there is no delineation as to from whom the Contractor should expect to receive information on the existing arrangements to be replaced, if any are to be replaced in connection with a transition, and the expectations of end users regarding capabilities they currently are using. Can you please either add that as a requirement for the Agency or one of the Agency's designated representatives?             | The RFP requires the contractor to obtain information on existing arrangements needed to complete a transition order. The Agency designated representative may have little or no information about the local arrangements associated with an Agency order. It is expected that the contractor will need to coordinate with the Agency or Agency component representatives, Local Government Contacts (LGCs) and other Agency service providers to obtain information on existing arrangements. This could include site visits, coordinated with the LGC, to obtain needed information. For service orders placed by a GSA activity, the contractor should coordinate with the GSA LGC, GSA component, and other GSA service providers for local arrangement information. For service orders placed by an Agency but associated with a GSA consolidated switch, the contractor should coordinate with GSA for information about the consolidated switch. |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP       | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|-----------|--|--|
|     | -           | Section   |  |  |
| 322 | Both        | G.1.1.2.3 | In the discussion of the GSA COR's Role, there is no delineation as to from whom the Contractor should expect to receive information on the existing arrangements under GSA-administered contracts to be replaced, if any are to be replaced in connection with a transition, and the expectations of end users regarding capabilities they currently are using. Can you please either add that as a requirement for the GSA COR or one of the GSA's designated representatives?   | The RFP requires the contractor to obtain information on existing arrangements needed to complete a transition order. The GSA COR or designated representative may have little or no information about the local arrangements associated with an order. It is expected that the contractor will need to coordinate with the Agency or Agency component representatives, Local Government Contacts (LGCs) and other Agency service providers to obtain information on existing arrangements. This could include site visits, coordinated with the LGC, to obtain needed information. For service orders placed by a GSA activity, the contractor should coordinate with the GSA LGC, GSA component, and other GSA service providers for local arrangement information. For service orders placed by an Agency but associated with a GSA consolidated switch, the contractor should coordinate with GSA for information about the consolidated switch. |
| 323 | Both        | G.4.4     | What remedies could the ombudsman order if in his/her opinion the fair opportunity process was not followed?   | It is anticipated that the ombudsman would notify the Administrative Contracting Officer of any recommended remedies.  |
| 324 | Both        | H.17      | The government intends to use available information to compare contractor's Networx prices with other Networx contractors, federal and state tariffs, other government contracts including MAS, price change indices, and other relevant source. If the government determines that the contractor's prices are not consistent with the comparison competitive prices, the government at its sole discretion will select a service for PMM analysis. Question: Is the intent to exclude all noncompetitively awarded contracts from the comparison base? Will the government share the results of this analysis with the contractor when proceeding to PMM Phase One? Please define the term "consistent with the comparison prices"? | It is the Government's intention to include in its analysis the most relevant comparison prices from a variety of available sources which may or may not include non-competitively awarded contracts. With regard to the second question, as stated in the RFP, "[t]here is no requirement for the Government to share its analysis with the contractor or provide a justification for its determination to proceed to Phase One." With regard to the third question, "consistent with comparison prices" refers to the method used by the Government to determine price competitiveness.  |
| 325 | Both        | H.12.3    | This clause requires the contractor to update any change to its corporate organization within 10 calendar days of any change. Changes to the corporate structure of large, diverse organizations and large subcontractors are often complex and time-consuming, and often require layers of internal approvals. Will GSA consider a longer timeframe (i.e., 30 days) for updating changes to the contractor's corporate organization?  | The information requested on the organization of the corporation is at the level of areas that impact GSA's ability to manage the contract. As such, the 10 calendar-day limit is appropriate. Longer than 10 days could adversely impact the level of Networx customer satisfaction.  |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|----------------|--|--|
| 326 | Both        | H.15           | This clause states that GSA shall have the right, partially or entirely, to terminate the contract without liability, if the contractor's tariff filings are not permitted to become effective by a governmental regulatory body or bodies within 105 calendar days after the date of Notice to proceed. Since the contractor has no control over governmental regulatory bodies, why should the contractor bear the full risk if tariff filings are not permitted to become effective through no fault of their own. Will GSA consider more leniency toward the contractor regarding the 105 days for tariffs to become effective or allowing more time?                              |  |
| 327 | Both        | H.15           | As a result of streamlined regulation by the FCC, the majority of services that most carriers would provide under the contract, there will be no need to file tariffs in advance of receiving Agency orders for service and, to the extent tariff requirements apply, new tariffs, newly tariffed products, and changes to prices and services descriptions can take effect very quickly. It is suggested that the initial tariff filing requirement in the first sentence of H.15(b) be revised to read: "The contractor shall file any initial tariff filings to implement the contract (if any are required), within sixty (60) calendar days after the date of Notice to Proceed." | The intent of the clause is for the CO to promptly receive any necessary tariff filings to ensure that the tariff filings do not cause undo delay on the contractor's ability to perform. If no filings are required, then this provision does not apply.  |
| 328 | Both        | H.19           | Section H.19 states that the "Subcontracting Plan shall be an individual plan for this contract, not corporate wide." FAR Clause No. 52.219-9(g) (incorporated by Section I.1.25) states that "A commercial plan is the preferred type of subcontracting plan for contractors furnishing commercial items." It is requested that the GSA abide by the referenced FAR clause and allow the Subcontracting Plan for this contract to be a commercial (one that is corporate wide) plan since the services being solicited are commercial items.  | As required in the RFP, the Subcontracting Plan shall be an individual plan for the Networx contract, not a corporate wide plan.   |
| 329 | Enterprise  | H.32           |  | Section H.32 defines Service Trials and will be clarified in an upcoming amendment. The selection of a service provider as a result of a fair opportunity decision does not require the inclusion of a service trial. The Government must follow the fair opportunity procedure for a Service Trial. |
| 330 | Enterprise  | 1.1.36         | This clause, FAR 52.223-6 Drug Free Workplace, is exempt from a commercial item contract and should be deleted. See FAR 23.501(b).   | Networx Universal and Networx Enterprise are being procured as FAR Part 15 acquisitions and not as FAR Part 12, Commercial Acquisitions. This clause is appropriate for the acquisitions.  |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|----------------|--|---|
| 331 | Both        | I.1.53         | Recommend substituting clause 52.229-4 with 52.229-3 Federal, State, and Local Taxes as it is more appropriate for this procurement. Will the Government modify this requirement?  | FAR 29.401-3 allows the use of FAR 52.229-4 when the Government believes that the price "would otherwise include an inappropriate contingency for potential post award change(s) in State or local taxes." The Government has made this determination, so no change will be made to the RFP.  |
| 332 | Enterprise  | I.1.54         | Please clarify that the incorporated FAR Clause (No. 52.229-5) is not applicable. In FAC 2001-13, FAR case 2000-016, effective April 13, 2003, this FAR Clause was deleted. (See http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/14mar20010800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/2003/03-6374.htm)  | Section I.1.54 will be revised in an upcoming amendment to replace "52.229-5" with "Reserved."  |
| 333 | Enterprise  | I.1.70         | Clause No. 52.242-1 (the correct title is "Notice of Intent to Disallow Costs," not "Reserved" as stated in I.1.70) only applies to cost-reimbursement, fixed price incentive or price redetermination contracts. Since the RFP does not cover any of these contract types, this clause should be deleted.   | Section I.1.70 will be revised in an upcoming amendment to replace "52.242-1" with "Reserved."  |
| 334 | Both        | 1.7            | FAR 52.217-9, "Option to Extend the Term of the Contract," states that the Government will provide a "preliminary written notice of its intent to extend at least 60 days before the contract expires," but that this preliminary notice "does not commit the Government to an extension." If the 60-day notice does not commit the Government, at what point and through what mechanism does the Government become committed to an extension? |   |
| 335 | Enterprise  | J              | Can the J Tables be included as appendices with links from the Technical and Management Vols. rather than including the actual tables within the body of the Vols.?  | Yes, the J Tables can be included as appendices to the proposal, these tables are provided as word files so that the entries for compliance, proposal reference, and exceptions/deviations can be entered into the tables by the offeror. The narrative responses, when required however, must be included in the body of the proposal. |
| 336 | Universal   | J.11           | The Glossary of Terms has the following statement: "The AHC may also be identified with whoever is actually receiving the service being provided." Does this mean that there could be multiple agencies identified with one AHC, with one receiving the service and one receiving the invoice? If so, this creates a non-standard billing situation. Please clarify.   | The AHC can be created to identify the Agency/Department which pays the bill or as an informational ID for a Bureau which actually uses the service. The AHC at the basic level can be at the Department level but other AHC's under that level can be created for reporting purposes only.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|----------------|--|---|
| 337 | Enterprise  | J.12.7         | This attachment does not appear in the Universal RFP however appears in the Enterprise RFP. Will GSA provide this same attachment for Universal?   | J.12.7 was deleted from Enterprise by Amendment 1.  |
| 338 | Universal   | J.9            | Sections C.2.4.1.3.1 and C.2.4.1.4.1 of the Stipulated Compliance Tables do not correlate with the actual IPS section (C.2.4.1) in Technical Requirements (C.2). Essentially, Section C.2.4.1.3.2 and C.2.4.1.4.1 does not exist within the Technical Requirements that reference 'UNI' interface at SDP and Performance Metrics for IPS. Q90.Will GSA revise the J table to reflect the correct reference?  |   |
| 339 | Both        | L.17           | Preparing oral presentations is a significant effort that must be accomplished well ahead of the 14-day (minimum) notification period stipulated in this RFP paragraph. To insure that presentations are comprehensive and fair, we suggest that the Government provide the following additional guidelines that outline their expectations for the oral presentation: Time allotted for the presentation Number of presenters allowed Number of attendees allowed Format for the presentation material (e.g. Word, PowerPoint, etc.) Agenda of the presentation/question and answer period. To insure that presentations are comprehensive and fair, we suggest that the Government provide the following additional guidelines that outline their expectations for the oral presentation: Time allotted for the presentation; Number of presenters allowed; Number of attendees allowed; Format for the presentation material (e.g. Word, PowerPoint, etc.); Agenda of the presentation/question and answer period. Would GSA provide the information requested? | If oral presentations are requested, the Government will provide additional details at the time of such request.  |
| 340 | Both        | L.29           | RFP states "Solicitation shall consist of four volumes." Will GSA consider replacing paragraph two with the following: "Each response to this solicitation shall consist of five volumes: Technical, Management, Past Performance, Business, and Price"?   | This change will be reflected in an upcoming Amendment.   |
| 341 | Enterprise  | L.30           | This subparagraph indicates that a preproposal conference will be held as indicated by the RFP cover letter. The cover letter did not address the preproposal conference. Has the conference been scheduled and, if so, what is the date, time and location? If not, when could we expect the announcement to be made?   | Enterprise RFP paragraph L.30 (a) was in error. Amendment 0001 to the Enterprise RFP corrected this paragraph and specifies that no preproposal conference is planned. Amendment 0001 was posted to http://www.fedbizopps.gov on 06/22/05. The Amendment also is available at http://www.gsa.gov/networx. |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question  | Redacted Answer  |
|-----|-------------|----------------|--|--|
| 342 | Enterprise  | L.33           | The offeror's Management Vol. currently includes 300 pages of requirements. That leaves only 200 pages for responses which is insufficient space to respond to the stated requirements. Can the RFP requirements that are to be embedded/included in the document in 8 pt Arial be embedded within the document as separate "documents" appearing as icons and thus not be included in the page count? If not, can the requirements be single-spaced? Is there another manner in which the RFP requirements can be excluded from the proposal/vol. page count?   | The format requirements for proposal volumes in Section L.33 (c), (d), and (e) will not be changed. Figures and charts may be reduced as stated in L.33 (d). Section L.33 (a) lists items that do not count against the page limitation. This includes the cross-reference tables (the 300 pages referenced in the question), certain plans, and appendices described in L.33.3. Items that do count against the 500 page limitation in the Management volume are the responses to narrative questions in the cross-reference tables and responses to the requirements in Section L. |
| 343 | Universal   | L.33           | Because this is a page-restricted proposal and RFP requirements will be cross-referenced for proposal responses, please consider removing the requirement to embed the RFP requirements into the proposal.   | L.33 (a) (6) identifies the J.9 cross reference tables as among the pages that do not count against the maximum number of pages. The responses to narrative requirements and any Exceptions or Deviations must be included in the volume text and do count against the maximum number of pages The cross-reference tables containing the RFP requirements can be attached to the appropriate proposal volumes as an attachment or appendix.  |
| 344 | Universal   | L.34.1         | It is not clear whether the NS/EP Functional Requirements Implementation Plan is due with the proposal or prior to contract award. C.5.2.2 states that "the contractor" shall provide the NS/EP with their proposal. Section F.2 ID #92 states that the plan is due "Upon contract award." Other plans that we assume are due with the proposal use the term "included at contract award." Furthermore, it is not listed as a part of the Management Volume, as specified in L.34.2.3, although parts of it are required in the Technical Volume, as is discussed in question 113 below. Q140. Is the NS/EP FRIP to be included with the proposal? |  |
| 345 | Both        | L.34.1         | Will GSA add a new section to the Technical Volume outline called "Access Arrangements?" Will GSA arrange the outline as specified below: a) Executive Summary b) Compliance with RFP Requirements c) Networx Architecture d' Transport/IP/Optical Services e) Management and Application Services f) Security Services g) Wireless and Special Services h) ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS i) Service Enabling Devices. This would provide evaluators with a single area in which access would be detailed and would limit the amount of detail repeated within the various service-specific narratives.  | The Government will not modify the RFP. The Government is procuring end-to-end services and expects Access Arrangements to be addressed in the context of the services provided.   |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP<br>Section | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|----------------|---|---|
| 346 | Enterprise  | L.34.1.3       | The offeror has currently structured its Technical Vol. such that we answer each lettered requirement under L.34.1.4.3 for each product, as follows: (a) Provide a technical description of how the service requirements (e.g., capabilities, features, interfaces) are satisfied. (i) Internet Protocol Service (ii) Network-based IP VPN Service (iii) Voice over Internet Protocol Transport Services Is this structure acceptable to GSA? Or would GSA like to see a service-by-service approach to each requirement? | In response to L.34.1.4.3 (a), the Government expects a technical description of how the service requirements (e.g., capabilities, features, interfaces) are satisfied for each mandatory Transport/IP/Optical Service. A service-by-service description shall be included for: C.2.4.1 Internet Protocol Service (IPS); C.2.7.3 Network-Based IP-VPN Services (NBIP-VPNS); C.2.7.8 Voice over Internet Protocol Transport Services (VoIPTS). Each requirement listed in L.34.1.4.3 shall be addressed service-by-service.  |
| 347 | Both        | L.34.1.4.1     | Will GSA change wording to: "Describe the synchronization network architecture to support the offeror's access and transport networks as applicable"? Not all the services categorized as transport/IP/optical require network synchronization.   | The Government will amend the RFP to clarify that the synchronization network architecture does not necessarily apply to each service.  |
| 348 | Both        | L.34.3.2       | What method will GSA use to contact the client references provided (i.e., phone interview, mailed questionnaire)? How will GSA assess performance on the client references provided?  | The method of contact with a reference will vary depend upon the distance involved, the availability of the reference, and any time constrains regarding the reference. References receive a copy of the Past Performance Questionnaire; should the interview be conducted via telephone, the reference will be provided a transcript of their comments, for their review. Should the reference take issue with any perceived misrepresentation of their comments, they may edit their comments for clarity. The assessment of performance is based upon the rating schematic defined in the Networx Source Selection Process and the Section M.4 of the RFP. |
| 349 | Both        | M.1.2.1        | How many of the proposals will be considered to be the" most highly rated" for purposes of the competitive range? If there is no pre-determined number, how will the Government decide what constitutes a "most highly rated proposa" for purposes of the competitive range?  | The competitive range determination will be based on the evaluation of the proposals. As such, the Government will not pre-determine the number of proposal that it considers to be the "most highly rated."  |
| 350 | Both        | M.1.2.2        | Under what conditions does the Government envision terminating the acquisition process?   | As Section M.1.2.2(a) states: "If none of the technical FPRs or none of the management FPRs or none of the past performance FPRs is eligible for award" and the Government elects not to "Request offerors to revise and resubmit their FPRs."  |
| 351 | Enterprise  | M.5.2.1        | How will the Government evaluate the risk posed by changes in the traffic model when the mandatory services required are mostly emerging services with little or no historical market data or current usage? What will be used as the basis for comparative costs for new or emerging services?   | The Government will use a variety of techniques including sensitivity analysis to evaluate risk. The evaluation of the services will be based on the offeror's prices, and will be taken into account in examining possible future usage patterns amongst other possible analyses.  |

| #   | Acquisition | RFP     | Redacted Question   | Redacted Answer   |
|-----|-------------|---------|---|---|
|     |             | Section |   |   |
| 352 | Both        |         | Redacted Question  A Proposal is composed of five Volumes (Technical, Management, Past Performance, Business, and Price) and Appendices. What are the Government's expectations regarding the structure for an individual Technical volume? | Listed below is a logical checklist of the required contents of a Technical Volume.  The list of logical components is provided as a checklist, not as a required volume outline, and applies to both Networx Universal and Networx Enterprise. The Technical Volume will have the following general components (lower level details vary with Universal, Enterprise—IP or Enterprise—Wireless submissions) as defined in L.34/L.35.  Table structures and formats are contained in Section J.9.  Technical Volume Checklist:  1. Executive Summary  2. Table of Contents, List of Figures, and List of Tables  3. Compliance with RFP Requirements  a. Completed Technical Volume Conformance to Instructions Table  b. Completed Technical Stipulated Requirements for Mandatory Services Compliance Table  c. Completed Technical Stipulated Requirements for Optional Services Compliance Table  d. Signed Technical Narrative Requirements for Mandatory Services Compliance Table  f. Completed Technical Narrative Requirements for Optional Services Compliance Table  f. Completed Technical Narrative Requirements for Optional Services Compliance Table  g. Response to Section L Network Architecture requirements statements  5. Response to Section L Management and Applications Services requirements statements  6. Response to Section L Management and Applications Services requirements statements  7. Response to Section L Wireless and Special (also Access Services in Enterprise only)  Services Requirements Statements  9. Response to Section L Service-Enabling Devices (SEDs) Requirements Statements and Completed SEDs Tables as Required in the Section L Technical Section  10. Exceptions/Deviations to any Technical RFP Requirements |
|     |             |         |   | 7. Response to Section L Security Services requirements statements 8. Response to Section L Wireless and Special (also Access Services in Enterprise only) Services Requirements Statements 9. Response to Section L Service-Enabling Devices (SEDs) Requirements Statements and Completed SEDs Tables as Required in the Section L Technical Section   |